



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

097300,671

04/27/99

TAKAGAKI

H

450100-4862

020999

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK NY 10151

WM02/1023

EXAMINER

TRINH, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2681

DATE MAILED:

10/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/300,671

Applicant(s)

TAKAGAKI, HIROKAZU

Examiner

Sonny TRINH

Art Unit

2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (Nakajima; Patent No. 5,940,769) in view of Stewart (Stewart; Patent No. 5,592,555).

Consider **claim 7**. With reference to figures 16-17 and their detailed descriptions, Nakajima teaches a mobile communication apparatus (48), comprising:

a) communication means for transmitting and receiving information signals to and from a base station (41-42) via radio waves (45, 47); said base station further transmitting and receiving information signals to and from a service provider (40) through a public line network (NW);

b) input/output means for a user to interact with said mobile communication apparatus; said input/output means comprising a keypad, display means, a speaker, and a microphone (inherent in most mobile telephone). However, Nakajima does not disclose the processing means for compressing and encrypting the information signals

transmitted to said base station by said communication means, and for decompressing and decrypting the information signals received from said base station by said communication means. In an analogous art, Stewart discloses a wireless communications privacy method and system, Stewart further discloses the processing means for compressing and encrypting the information signals transmitted to a remote unit by said communication means, and for decompressing and decrypting the information signals received from said base station by said communication means (abstract, figure 2, column 4). Stewart further teaches the memory means for storing information signals from said processing means (column 6, specifically lines 3-20). However, the combination of Nakajima and Stewart does not disclose that said memory means including a removable semiconductor memory. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a removable memory module since it was known in the art that having a removable / exchangeable memory module greatly enhance the flexibilities of the wireless handset by changing subscriber's profile / personal information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to include, within the Nakajima's system, the encrypting / decrypting, compressing and decompressing, as taught by Stewart, and the obvious statement made by the Examiner in order to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7. The motivation for combining would be to save time when downloading data with the added security of encrypting the data before transmitting.

Consider **claim 8**. Stewart further teaches the communication apparatus comprising recording/reproducing means for recording information signals input to said

memory means and for reproducing information signals stored in said memory means (column 6).

Consider **claim 10**. The combination of Nakajima and Stewart together with the obvious statement made by the Examiner discloses the invention, however, the combination does not disclose a headphone device so that a user can listen to the information. However, using a headphone is widely known and used in the communication field and the Examiner takes Official notice of such use for protecting the privacy of the information (i.e. music, voice) that is being presented to the user or when the user simply does not want to be bother by any other noise source or does not want to bother anybody else.

Consider **claim 11**. Stewart further teaches the information signals include voice data and music data (abstract, "...voice communication signals or any arbitrary data stream that is to be communicated from one point to another...", columns 1-2).

2. **Claims 9, 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (Nakajima; Patent No. 5,940,769), Stewart (Stewart; Patent No. 5,592,555) and in further view of Kariya (Kariya; Patent No. 6,169,897).

Consider **claim 9**. The combination of Nakajima and Stewart together with the obvious statement made by the Examiner discloses the invention, however, the combination does not disclose that said public line network is the internet and said base station communicates with said service provider using a universal resource locator. In another analogous art, Kariya discloses a mobile communications system which provides a mobile subscriber with local information. Kariya further discloses that said

public line network is the internet and said base station communicates with said service provider using a universal resource locator (figures 1-2, detailed description, column 3, line 54 to column 5, line 32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to include, within the Nakajima's system, the encrypting / decrypting, compressing and decompressing, as taught by Stewart, the obvious statement made by the Examiner, and the internet with the URL, as taught by Kariya in order to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9. The motivation for combining would be to tap into the vast information afforded by the internet.

3. **Claims 12, 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (Nakajima; Patent No. 5,940,769), Stewart (Stewart; Patent No. 5,592,555) and in further view of Bowen (Bowen; Patent No. 6,052,606).

Consider **claim 12**. The combination of Nakajima and Stewart together with the obvious statement made by the Examiner discloses the invention, however, the combination does not disclose that display means comprises a liquid crystal display (LCD) having a touch sensing screen, whereby the user can input information signals by touching said touch sensing screen. In another analogous art, Bowen discloses a cellular telephone handset with a liquid crystal display screen including a touch sensitive functions using said LCD (abstract, figure 2, touch sensitive display 17, columns 1-2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to include, within the Nakajima's system, the encrypting / decrypting, compressing and decompressing, as taught by Stewart, the obvious

statement made by the Examiner, and the touch sensitive LCD, as taught by Bowen in order to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12. The motivation for combining would be to enable a larger amount of information to be displayed simultaneously with the function keys on the screen.

As to **claims 13-18**, these claims merely reflect the method claim to the apparatus claim of claims 7-12 (respectively) and are therefore rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-6** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry, for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sonny Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-1961. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Sonny Trinh S.T.

PATENT EXAMINER

10/10/01

Tracy Legree
TRACY LEGREE
PRIMARY EXAMINER